DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 550 SO 023 414

AUTHOR Johnson, Karen A.
TITLE Q-Methodology: Perceptions of International Student Services in Higher Education.
PUB DATE 14 Apr 93
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Educational Administration; Educational Research; *Foreign Students; Higher Education; *International Educational Exchange; *Q Methodology; *Services; *Student Attitudes; Student Experience; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Student Support Services; University of Southern Mississippi

ABSTRACT

This study examined the perceptions of international students regarding their use and the effectiveness of services provided to them at one particular institution of higher education. Specifically, Q-methodology was used to determine whether a set of statements regarding student services could be used to identify clusters of these students in regard to their use of services and their perceptions of effectiveness of services. The study sample consisted of 17 international students who were nonimmigrant aliens who had been accepted for a course of study, usually under an F-1 visa. Results of the study suggested that international students generally fell into three clusters, each having different perceptions and different levels of usage of international student services on their campus. No relationship was found between perceptions of services or use of services and the amount of time the student had been attending the university. The group termed dissatisfied nonusers underutilized available student services because they did not think the International Student Services staff cared about their problems since they had never shown a personal interest in these students. Another reason for underutilization was that this group simply preferred to keep their problems to themselves or ask friends and relatives for advice. The second group were selective users of international student services. These students asked for help in academic or immigration matters, but preferred to discuss their biggest problem, finances, with friends and relatives. The third group, satisfied selective users, were familiar with services and saw the staff as knowledgeable and helpful. (DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 363 550

Q-Methodology: Perceptions of International Student Services in Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
KAREN JOHNSON
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Karen A. Johnson

University of Southern Mississippi

Running Head: INTERNATIONAL PERCEPTIONS

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 12-16, 1993, Atlanta, GA.

SO 023 414

Q-METHODOLOGY: PERCEPTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

One of the newest branches of student services in colleges and universities in the United States is international student services. Considering that the evolution of the student services organization in general has been so disorganized, the evolution of international student services has been even more so. Because of recent global changes, many U.S. institutions are exploring the opportunity for international student exchange. Colleges and universities in the United States could potentially benefit from the influx of international students as countries relax their restrictions on study abroad, but they must also consider the potential problems of racism, xenophobia, competition, and integration. Despite economic troubles, higher education in the United States is seen by many as the best system in the world, and many foreign students are anxious to come to the United States to be educated. In turn, international students have a wealth of knowledge to contribute to the American educational system.

Despite the many barriers facing international students, their numbers continue to increase on American campuses. In 1930, only 9,643 "foreign" students were studying in the United States (Du Bois, 1956). By contrast, more recent figures indicate an all-time high international student enrollment of 419,585 for the 1991-92 academic year (Watkins, 1992). Considering declining enrollments among American students, student service professionals clearly need to respond to the unique concerns and issues faced by international students if American universities hope to maintain a solid base of international students among their matriculants.

International Student Services in American Colleges & Universities

The international student services function was developed as a branch of general student services activities in response to the needs of a growing population of students on U.S. campuses in the sixties and seventies (Barr & Upcraft, 1990). Services were initially provided by various offices and locations throughout college and university campuses, as they were for the general

student population. However, as the numbers of international students increased, a more centralized system was deemed necessary on most campuses in order to respond to the unique needs of international students. Interestingly, even though student services are typically decentralized for the general student population, these services are more often than not centralized for international students. Hence, the international student services office generally attempts to provide almost all of the services needed by international students. As Eddy has noted:

> The foreign student advisor usually assists with foreign student admissions, placement, orientation, financial aid, housing, program of English as a second language, academic advising, personal counseling, student-community relationships, alumni relations, and pre-departure orientation. (1978, p. 47)

Akinniyi (1992) listed six diverse general services which are typically provided by the international student services office: academic advising, financial advising, personal advising, immigration advising, orientation programs, and workshops on topics of concern to international students. Despite the common needs of international students, each institution is unique in terms of the types of services provided and the organizational structure of the international office (Cunningham, 1991).

Hammer (1992) reported that research conducted on international student adaptation is one important conceptual basis for the mission of international student advising offices.

> It is suggested that a mission of international student advising offices that is culturally responsive and sensitive in its approach to assisting foreign students include the following four elements: (1) assist international students with the various problems they encounter in adapting to American culture, (2) provide cross-cultural psychological and adjustment counseling services to international students, (3) act as information brokers and communication networkers with international students, and

(4) view the offices' overall function in terms of facilitating the culture learning of the international students. (p. 229)

Counseling is consistently identified as one of the most important services for international students. Cadieux and Wehrly (1986) noted, "There is no clear line that distinguishes the tasks of advising and counseling international students. Advisers of foreign students recognize that international students sometimes need specialized help from counselors" (p. 56). Some of the problems that may require specialized counseling are loneliness and homesickness, loss of status and identity, fear of failure, depression, and somatic symptoms. These authors and many others caution that international students' emotional problems may evolve into physical problems. This is partly due to the stigma associated with personal counseling; it is much more acceptable for international students to receive medical attention than to seek counseling.

In a comprehensive paper on counseling international students, Pedersen (1991) discussed theories about counseling international students, provided personal accounts of his counseling experiences, and gave practical suggestions for those who provide counseling to international students. One of Pedersen's suggestions for future research is the need for identification of the direction and trends of international student growth and the effects of those trends on higher education.

Boyer and Sedlacek (1989) questioned why international students underutilize services even though they experience more adjustment problems than do U.S. students. Two hundred thirty international students completed a 23 item questionnaire. Results indicated that 13% of the students used counseling center services, while 87% did not. The three noncognitive variables which successfully predicted counseling center use were (a) the understanding and ability to deal with racism, (b) preference for long-term goals over short-term, immediate needs, and (c) nontraditional ways of acquiring knowledge. The overall underutilization of counseling brings into question the effectiveness of all services being provided to international students.

The Adjustment Process and Needs of International Students

Many researchers have studied the problems faced by international students. For example, Foust (1981) examined the cultural adjustment of students, subsequently developing a theory of adjustment called the "U-curve":

> The curve attempts to illustrate the period of high excitement and anticipation a sojourner usually feels when preparing for the trip and upon arrival in the new setting. The early stimulation of sights, sounds and people can be very invigorating and can lead to great excitement and pleasure. But after a week or two, or some relatively short period of time, the letters from home seem to come slow in arriving, the food is not satisfying, the 'guest' relationship is over and the hard work of adjustment begins. As all of this happens, satisfaction with the situation declines. Only after some more weeks (or longer) of adjustment and work does the curve begin to rise again; only after a new set of social relationships develops, after adjustment has taken place does satisfaction increase. (Foust, 1981, p. 10)

Foust noted that several sets of factors will influence the nature of a person's adjustment to a new culture, including situational factors, awareness of one's own and the new culture, individual characteristics, and communication patterns.

In another study, 46 foreign students were interviewed (Heikinheimo & Shute, 1986). The researchers identified language skills, academic issues, cultural differences, racial discrimination, and social interaction as the areas requiring the most adaptation and adjustment. The implications of this study included the need for university personnel to recognize that academic achievement is the highest priority for almost all of these students. In addition, it was suggested that students should be encouraged to adopt a receptive view concerning their life-style since adaptation is a process that blends academic, social, financial, cultural, and language-related elements.

In an effort to increase the extant knowledge about adjusting to life in a foreign culture, Hannigan (1990) attempted to identify the important criteria for successful cross-cultural functioning. He classified these factors into three categories: skills/abilities, attitudes, and personality traits. Abilities include interpersonal and communication skills, listening and organizational skills, and dealing with psychological stress. Attitudes that are important for international students to possess include cultural empathy, acceptance of others, a non-judgmental attitude, respect for the host culture, and a sense of politics. Traits which play an important role in effectiveness are patience, courtesy, persistence with flexibility, energy, and self-confidence.

When international students do not possess the criteria for effectiveness in another culture, they may experience alienation. Schram and Lauver (1988) distributed questionnaires to 266 international students at a large southwestern university in the United States. The questionnaire contained three parts: an investigation of respondent demographics, the Social Contract Scale, and the University Alienation Scale. Social contact, graduate status, and geographical home region were the best predictors of alienation experienced at the university. These three categories accounted for 10% of the variance in alienation. The authors noted that this is a a correlational rather than a causal relationship, but suggested that programs for international students might appropriately be tailored to particular target groups. Moreover, orientation programs were identified as a way to become acquainted with Americans and avoid isolation and alienation.

Leong and Sedlacek (1989) compared 215 incoming international students to a sample of 1000 United States students on academic and career needs. Two general patterns emerged from this study: (a) international students expressed a greater number of various academic and career needs than did U.S. students, and (b) the rank-ordering of relative importance of various needs was different across the two groups. This finding supports the notion that international students place a greater emphasis on the academic aspects of a college education than the social and extracurricular aspects. Other studies confirm that

most international students place higher priority on academic adjustment than on interpersonal happiness and involvement with the new culture (Cadieux & Wehrly, 1986; Dillard & Chisolm, 1983; Pedersen, 1991).

Sefa Dei (1992) observed that most accounts of the problems of international students have been conducted from perspectives other than those of the students themselves. He subsequently wrote of his personal experiences in a Canadian university. The author provided information about the history and current state of international students in Canada. The problems he experienced included isolation, the lack of formality between teachers and students, and the instructors' non-adherence to strict curriculum guidelines or straight lecture format. In addition, the ideologies of competitiveness and individual responsibility were disconcerting. The author's resulting advice is that the intent of student programs should be to integrate and not segregate international students. He recommended that educational administrators and policy makers work in conjunction with international students, teachers, and other students to devise a more comprehensive and meaningful program to help international students deal with the multitude of problems they encounter.

Based on their search of previous research, Lee, Abd-Ella, and Burks (1981) concluded that there was insufficient assessment of foreign student needs conducted on a national scale. Thus, they developed their problem statement: What are the met and unmet needs of foreign students in the United States? Their research sample consisted of 1900 foreign students at 30 universities and colleges in the United States with foreign student enrollments over 300. A questionnaire was distributed to determine student needs. Many categories of needs were identified, including information needs, degree program needs, academic program relevancy needs, extracurricular professional activity needs, academic life needs, financial needs, community life and interpersonal relationship needs, housing needs, family life needs, pre-return needs, anticipated post-return needs, and linguistic needs. The findings indicated that, in every category, needs were not satisfied to the level of students' expectations. Most needs were

satisfied to at least some extent; however, the students' levels of satisfaction did not measure up to the students' levels of importance. The conclusion was the U.S. institutions need to examine international students' needs and construct programs accordingly. More relevant policies and guidelines are needed to guide institutions in policy and program formulation.

Perceptions of Effectiveness of Services

Despite the response of many universities to the needs of international students, the extant literature overwhelmingly concludes that the services typically provided to international students are both underutilized and perceived as ineffective (Akinniyi, 1992; Dillard & Chisolm, 1983; Lee, Abd-Ella, & Burks, 1981; Selvadurai, 1991).

Hammer (1992) noted that the effectiveness of services provided to international students depends largely on consensus within the departments, foreign student advising offices, and the university community at large concerning the institution's core mission. Moreover, Hammer added: "The delineation of the international student advising office's mission statement provides the conceptual foundation for subsequent decisions regarding the goals, particular methods for achieving these goals, and the roles and responsibilities of office management and advisers" (1992, p. 218).

Much research has been done to assess the changing needs of college students, since a thorough understanding of student needs is crucial to development of effective student service programs. Barrow, Cox, Sepich, and Spivak (1989) examined the degree to which a needs assessment survey could predict student use of counseling center services. The researchers recognized that different groups of students have different need profiles according to race, sex, and class differences. Two hundred sixty-nine students at a university responded to a mailed survey regarding their perception of the importance of various developmental needs. They also indicated which services they would be most likely to use. In order to compare the relationship between students' actual use of services and their survey responses to this question, four years of records were kept regarding counseling center use and workshop participation. The results indicated that the needs assessment survey was only modestly indicative of the students' use of

services over four years. Hence, the authors concluded that multiple sources of information should be used in assessing students' needs. Needs surveys may be more helpful in identifying services that students are unlikely to use than in predicting ones that they are likely to use.

In an attempt to measure the effectiveness of international student services, Zelmer and Johnson (1988) surveyed university graduates after they had returned to their home countries. One of the sections of their questionnaire dealt with use of and satisfaction with university facilities. Most of the students were at least aware of the various services available, although not all services were frequently used. The sentiment was that most services were generally satisfactory; however, the authors concluded that international students are likely not well served by existing student clubs and organizations and that special strategies may need to be developed, such as providing services through a separate international students' office.

Selvadurai (1991) found that academic needs of international students were not satisfied even to minimum levels. He surveyed 137 international students at a single institution with a 33 item questionnaire. Some of the academic needs identified were assistance for improvement in English, counseling in curriculum programming, academic advising, rapport with faculty, availability of tutoring services, and orientation to the academic setting. Regarding the areas of personal services, assistance with financial aid matters, and counseling on immigration and tax laws, students expressed minimum satisfactory levels. Selvadurai noted that the needs of services for students will differ at different institutions and thus there is a need for periodic need assessments similar to the one reported in his study.

Obong (1984) investigated the impact of non-academic needs of all students on a given campus. He surveyed 100 international and 100 non-international students at Atlanta University. Overall, international students tended to be dissatisfied while non-international students were satisfied in the eight non-academic needs areas. Both groups were satisfied with programmatic opportunities afforded by the university.

Tabdili-Azar (1984) surveyed 506 international students and 20 foreign student advisors near the San Francisco Bay area, addressing differences between students' and advisors'

perceptions regarding the frequency of use, importance, and effectiveness of the services provided by the foreign student advisors' office. International students were significantly more negative than advisers regarding most areas examined by the survey. Students perceived themselves as using the services with much less frequency than advisors did, and also rated the services as less effective than did the advisers. The recommendations for improved services included the suggestion to use veteran international students as counselors to incoming students.

Barnett (1991) attempted to measure effectiveness of international programs as perceived by administrators. There were 139 respondents to her survey, including chief administrative officers, department heads or chairpersons of academic departments, directors of international student service centers, study abroad program advisors, and directors of area study centers. The highest perceived effectiveness scores of student academic development, student career development, and faculty and administrator employment satisfaction in the international studies programs were held by chief administrative officers. The author concluded that "perhaps chief administrative officers are not closely enough associated with international program functions to accurately perceive effectiveness in international programs" (p. 417).

The question remains as to who should measure effectiveness of international student services provided by an institution. Tillman (1990) recognized the difficulty of establishing adequate support services, as well as evaluating their effectiveness:

> An institution with a clear set of priorities about the role of international educational activities in the context of undergraduate education is more likely to develop effective support services than one that views international education as a frill or as lying on the fringe of the 'real' mission of the college. (p. 88)

Tillman discussed support services for international students by examining institutional realities, organization and coordination of support services, and program development and professional resources. He recommended that programs should consider both the academic and personal needs of students, and should be created by the foreign student advisor and support staff.

PURPOSE

Since students are the main clients of a university organization, their input is a potentially valuable tool for administrators who are concerned with the effectiveness of student services . Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to examine the perceptions of international students regarding their use and the effectiveness of services provided to them at one particular institution of higher education. Specifically, Q-methodology was used to determine whether a set of statements regarding student services could be used to identify clusters of these students in regard to their use of services and their perceptions of effectiveness of services.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample for the present study consisted of 17 international students enrolled at the University of Southern Mississippi. These international students were nonimmigrant aliens who have been accepted for a course of study, usually under an F-1 visa.

Instrumentation

The Q-sort technique was developed in 1953 by William Stephenson and Sir G. H. Thomson (Stephenson, 1953). Q-methodology emerged as a form of factor analysis after Stephenson suggested that an investigator could correlate any facet of measurement across another. Hence, a researcher can factor persons rather than their test results, for example (Brooks, 1970). It is important to distinguish between "Q-sort technique" and "Q-methodology." Q-sort technique is the card-sorting procedure used to gather subjects' responses. Q-methodology, however, is a more comprehensive term, including correlations of persons based on the Q-sort technique card-sorting responses, a specialized use of questionnaire items, forced responses, and factor analysis (Brooks, 1970).

This technique is ideal for studying persons because the individual provides his or her own frame of reference, also called an ~~international~~ internal frame of reference. Q-methodology is often used in attitude studies because it is an objective, organized method for studying many aspects of a person's attitudes and behavior. It is a small-sample method of categorizing people based on

common responses. Carr (1992) notes that:

> Q-technique has been used to investigate clusterings of people based on variables such as attitudes, preferences, and thinking behaviors. With Q-technique factor analysis it is possible to obtain factors that can be thought of as idealized "types" of persons. (Carr, 1992, p. 137)

The instrument used in the present study, International Student Perceptions was developed by the researcher based on an extensive literature review in the field of international student services and personal conversations with international students. The instrument consists of 40 statements regarding services provided for international students on university and college campuses. Data were also collected on the length of time the subject had been attending the university. The survey items are included in Appendix A.

Data Collection and Analysis

The instrument was administered individually to 17 international students attending a comprehensive university in the southern United States. Subjects were given an instruction sheet, oral instructions, and a package of 40 cards on which the statements were printed. Subjects were asked to sort the cards into seven piles on a Likert-type scale which is illustrated on the instruction sheet (See Appendix B). The piles ranged from strongly disagree on their left-hand side to strongly agree on their right-hand side. Since the researcher employed a 'forced sort' technique, each pile could contain only a specified number of cards, and these numbers were included on the instruction sheet. Subjects proceeded to sort the cards and then recorded the card numbers on the instruction sheet below the appropriate pile symbol. The completed instruction sheets were identified only by the amount of time the student had attended the institution.

Once the data were collected, the researcher assigned a value of "1" to items in the left pile (strongly disagree), a value of "2" to the items sorted into the next pile to the right, and so forth. The 'forced sort' procedure instructed subjects to place two cards in the left pile which was strongly disagree, four cards in the next pile, eight cards in the next pile, 12 cards in the neutral pile, eight cards in the next pile, four cards in the next pile, and two cards in the far right pile,

which was strongly agree. With a forced sort technique, the experimenter specifies the shape and scatter of the distribution curve. In the present case, the respondent's ratings of the items resulted in a quasi-normal distribution.

RESULTS

Data were analyzed using the SPSSX FACTOR procedure and a "transposed" raw data matrix, i.e., persons defined the columns and variables defined the rows of the matrix. Factors were extracted using the principal components method, and results were rotated to the varimax criterion. Three factors were extracted based on a visual 'scree' test. Person factors were determined based on a minimum factor-structure coefficient criterion of |.43|. The resulting factor matrix is presented in Table 1. Factor scores for the items are presented in Table 2.

Analysis of Factors

Factor I

Of the 17 subjects, six were highly correlated with factor I. One person who was highly correlated with Factor I was more closely correlated with Factor II. Consulting the Table 2 factor scores for each item, it is apparent that persons in Factor I positively identified with statements 2, 20, 28, 34, and 35. These persons responded negatively to statements 4, 7, 11, 15, 30, and 37. An analysis of these items indicates that this group infrequently use services provided to international students, and they are dissatisfied with existing services on this campus. This group was labeled "Dissatisfied Nonusers."

Factor II

Of the total population of subjects, six were highly correlated with Factor II. Consulting factor scores for each item, persons in Factor II positively rated statements 8, 15, 16, 22, 28, 30, and 38. They responded negatively to statements 6, 14, 17, 20, 26, 32, 36, and 37. These item ratings suggest that persons in this group are selective users of international student services. Although they worry about their financial situation, they have not asked for help on this issue from the international student services office. They have asked for help with academic and immigration questions, but not for personal problems. This group was labeled "Selective Users."

Factor III

Of the total subject population, five were highly correlated with Factor III. Persons in Factor III have higher than average ratings for items 5, 13, 18, 24, 25, 27, and 35. They responded more negatively to statements 7, 17, 20, 22, and 30. Based on the content of these items, this group seemed confident in the abilities and knowledge of the international student services office staff, but were selective users. They had asked for help with immigration problems, and found orientation and workshops helpful, but they did not ask for help with academic advising. This group was labeled "Satisfied Selective Users."

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study suggest that international students generally fall into three clusters, each having different perceptions and different levels of usage of international student services on their campus. Since three distinct cluster of individuals were identified using Q-methodology, this procedure appears to be an accurate measure of perceptions of student services within groups. Specific remarks regarding subjects' perceptions and use of services follow.

The only demographic information requested of subjects was the length of time they have been at this university. After data analysis, it became clear that there was no relationship between perceptions of services or use of services and the amount of time the student had been attending the university. For example, subjects in Factor I had attended for 4.5 years, 6 months, 6 months, 2.5 months, 1.5 years, and 1.5 years. Subjects in Factor II had attended for 10 months, 2 months, 3 years, 7 months, 3 months, and 1.5 years. Subjects in Factor III had attended for 1.5 years, 1.3 years, 9 months, 9 months, and 9 months.

A closer examination of persons in Factor I, "Dissatisfied Nonusers," indicates that this group, although they attended and understood orientation, has rarely used any of the services provided to them. In fact, the group indicated not having asked for help with financial, personal, immigration, or academic problems or questions. One of the reasons for underutilization may be that they do not think the International Student Services staff care about their problems since they have never shown personal interest in these students. Another reason for underutilization

may be that this group simply prefers to keep their problems to themselves or ask friends and relatives for advice, as they indicated on the survey.

The underutilization of services is not surprising; several researchers have confirmed this trend, especially with regard to personal counseling services (Akinniyi, 1992; Dillard & Chisolm, 1983). Some of the reasons given by students for not using services are lack of awareness, trust, and confidentiality, and perceptions of staff incompetence (Akinniyi, 1992).

A look at persons in Factor II suggests that some students are selective users of international student services. Subjects in this group indicated being extremely troubled by financial worries to the extent that their worries interfere with their school work; however, they have not asked for any help from international student services regarding these financial problems. These students have asked for help on matters of immigration and academics, but prefer to take their personal problems to friends and relatives. Perhaps financial problems are considered personal to these students. Overall, the international student services staff are seen as helpful, caring, and knowledgeable by this group.

The salience of financial problems is common amongst international students. Cadieux and Wehrly (1986) reported that lack of sufficient funds is the second most commonly expressed concern of international students:

> The assumption that most international students come from wealthy backgrounds or have access to more than sufficient funds for their education is erroneous. Financial stress affects students' academic life by consuming their emotional energy as well as by prompting students to take heavier academic loads in order to graduate as soon as possible. (Cadieux & Wehrly, 1986, p. 52)

Weiler (1984) notes that some Asian students are fully supported by private government sponsorships or international assistance agencies, but many are self-supported.

Factor III was labeled "Satisfied Selective Users," since these persons see the international student services staff as knowledgeable, helpful, and able to deal with immigration

problems. This group stated they have asked staff for help but only attended orientation and workshops, which are group situations. They do not seek help on an individual basis for academic or financial concerns, even though they agree that orientation reduced their fear of visiting the international student services office to ask for help. Instead, subjects in Factor III prefer to talk to a professor about academic concerns.

Academic advising has been identified as one of the most crucial services for international students since academics are of high priority to them (Cadieux & Wehrly, 1986; Dillard & Chisolm, 1983; Leong & Sedlacek, 1989). It is possible that, since international students encounter generally the same academic problems as their American counterparts, they prefer to ask professors for academic help, as do most students.

The results of the present study suggest several questions worthy of future research. First, which demographic characteristics are predictive of use of student services? Nationality, age, and gender may affect students' perception of services. Atkinson, Whiteley, and Gim (1990) found that level of acculturation for Asian-American college students was related to their ratings of counselor/psychologist as a help provider. Second, are student perceptions of effectiveness of services related to their use of services? If they are, one would expect a relationship between having attended orientation, finding orientation helpful, and use of services mentioned during orientation. This was not the case for students in Factors I and III. Finally, are self-report surveys such as Q-methodology indicative of use of services, or are there more valid measures of student services use? Kuh (1982) questioned whether or not students are always aware of their needs. Barrow, Cox, Sepich and Spivak's (1989) needs assessment survey proved only modestly indicative of the group and workshop services the students used over the subsequent four years. These authors concluded that multiple sources of information should be used in assessing students' needs.

CONCLUSION

Institutions of higher education are beginning to react to the global society. An influx of international students in American colleges and universities has changed the entire campus

environment, from academics to social activities. These changes have the potential to create a truly unique multicultural environment, which would ideally work as a model for the greater community. It is likely that the future will bring strong demand for program evaluation in higher education. Perhaps a formula can be derived which accurately measures student need for services, provision of services, student use, and outcomes assessment. For international students, this will necessitate extensive contact and evaluation after they have returned to work in their home country.

If the current trend continues, the numbers of international students coming to study in the U.S. will continue to increase, as will the number of American students in study abroad programs. International student services are vital for the smooth transition of students from one culture to another. Counselors must do several things to be effective with international students; understand the values of persons in various cultures, examine their own cultural values and beliefs, learn effective communication skills, practice empathy, and learn about other countries. Perhaps then we will be able to effectively assist international students in adapting to a new way of life. Support services structured toward the unique needs of international students will attract many more talented students who have much to contribute to the learning environment in our country.

References

Akinniyi, G. O. (1992). The effect of foreign students' perceptions of their relationship with the international office personnel. College Student Journal, 26(2), 215-222.

Atkinson, D. R., Whiteley, S., & Gim, R. H. (1990). Asian-American acculturation and preferences for help providers. Journal of College Student Development, 31(2), 155-161.

Barnett. R. V. (1991). Administrators' perceptions of effectiveness of international studies and programs in institutions of higher education. Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 417A.

Barr, M. J., & Upcraft, M. L. (1990). New futures for student affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barrow, J., Cox. P., Sepich, R., & Spivak, R. (1989). Student needs assessment surveys: Do they predict student use of services? Journal of College Student Development, 30(1), 77-82.

Boyer, S. P., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1989). Noncognitive predictors of counseling center use by international students. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67(7), 404-407.

Brooks, W. D. (1970). Q-sort technique. In P. Emmert & W. D. Brooks (Eds.), Methods of research in communication (pp. 165-180). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Cadieux, R. A. J., & Wehrly, B. (1986). Advising and counseling the international student. New Directions for Student Services: Guiding the Development of Foreign Students, 36, 51-63.

Carr, S. C. (1992). A primer on the use of Q-technique factor analysis. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 25, 133-138.

Cunningham, C. G. (1991). The integration of international students on Canadian post-secondary campuses. CBIE Research, 1, 1-16.

Dillard, J. M., & Chisolm, G. B. (1983). Counseling the international student in a multicultural context. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24(2), 101-105.

Du Bois, C. (1956). Foreign students and higher education in the United States. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Eddy, J. (1978). College student personnel development, administration, and counseling. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Foust, S. (1981). Dynamics of cross-cultural adjustment: From pre-arrival to re-entry. In G. Althen (Ed.), Learning across cultures (pp. 7-33). Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Hammer, M. R. (1992). Research, mission statements, and international student advising offices. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16(2), 217-236.

Hannigan, T. P. (1990). Traits, attitudes, and skills that are related to intercultural effectiveness and their implications for cross-cultural training: A review of the literature. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14(1), 89-111.

Heikinheimo, P. S., & Shute, J. C. M. (1986). The adaptation of foreign students: Student views and institutional implications. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27(5), 399-406.

Kuh, G. D. (1982). Purposes and principles for needs assessment in student affairs. Journal of College Student Personnel, 23, 202-209.

Lee, M. Y., Abd-Ella, M., & Burks, L. A. (1981). Needs of foreign students from developing nations at U.S. colleges and universities. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Leong, F. T. L., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1989). Academic and career needs of international and United States college students. Journal of College Student Development, 30(2), 106-111.

Obong, E. E. (1984). A comparative study of the non-academic needs of the international and non-international university students relative to student services provided them (Doctoral dissertation, Atlanta University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 3997B.

Pedersen, P. B. (1991). Counseling international students. The Counseling Psychologist, 19(1), 10-58.

Schram, J. L., & Lauver, P. J. (1988). Alienation in international students. Journal of College Student Development, 29(2), 146-150.

Sefa Dei, G. J. (1992). The social reality of international post-secondary students in Canada. CBIE Research, 3, 1-15.

Selvadurai, R. H. (1991). Adequacy of selected services to international students in an urban technical college. The Urban Review, 23(4), 271-285.

Stephenson, W. (1935). Technique of factor analysis. Nature, 136, 297.

Tabdili-Azar, A. (1984). An evaluation of the effectiveness of student services as perceived by international students and foreign student advisers (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45 2416A.

Tillman, M. J. (1990). Effective support services for international students. In R. K. Greenfield (Ed.), Developing international education programs (pp. 87-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Watkins, B. T. (1992, November 25). Foreign enrollment at U.S. colleges and universities totaled 419,585 in 1991-92, an all-time high. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A28.

Weiler, H. N. (1984). The political dilemmas of foreign study. Comparative Education Review, 28(2), 168-179.

Appendix A

International Student Perceptions

1. I trust the International Student Services staff with my problems.
2. International Student Services staff do not care about my financial situation.
3. International Student Services staff can help me with academic problems.
4. I have asked the International Student Services staff for help with my personal problems.
5. Workshops for international students are worthwhile.
6. The International Student Services staff play a role of police rather than advising.
7. International Student Services staff show personal interest in my school work and class schedule.
8. Financial problems are my greatest worry.
9. Orientation portrayed good images of the International Student Services staff.
10. Since I have been at USM, I have been to the International Student Services office 3 or 4 times.
11. I take my personal problems to the international student counselor.
12. International Student Services staff are not really concerned with my academic problems.
13. International Student Services staff can work out problems with immigration.
14. USM provides excellent services for international students.
15. I have asked International Student Services staff for help with my immigration questions.
16. I will have to go home if I run out of money.
17. International Student Services staff are too busy to help me.
18. I prefer to talk to a professor about academic advising.
19. Orientation was well advertised - most international students knew about it.
20. I have never asked the International Student Services staff for any help.

21. If I share my problems, the International Student Services staff will use it against me.

22. My worries about money interfere with my school work.

23. USM does not care about international students.

24. International Student Services staff know the law and rules for immigration.

25. Orientation reduced my fear of visiting the International Student Services office to ask for help.

26. Since I have been at USM, I have been to the International Student Services office once or twice.

27. More workshops for international students would be helpful.

28. I prefer to take my personal problems to my close friends or relatives.

29. Services provided to international students at USM are poor.

30. I have asked International Student Services staff for help with academic problems.

31. I have attended one or more workshops for international students.

32. International Student Services staff are cold and do not care about my problems.

33. If I have a problem with my visa, International Student Services staff can help.

34. I keep my personal problems to myself.

35. I understood most of the orientation to USM.

36. It is a waste of time going to the International Student Services office.

37. I have asked the International Student Services staff for help with my financial problems.

38. Since I have been at USM, I have been to the International Student Services office more than five times.

39. Services provided to international students at USM meet my needs.

40. Workshops for international students are well advertised.

Appendix B

Circle One: ELI Student USM Student

How long have you been at USM? _____

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Arrange the cards into 7 piles as shown below. The number of cards you are allowed to put in each pile is indicated in the box.

2. Write the card numbers below the appropriate box on this sheet.

Strongly Disagree - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Neutral - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Strongly Agree

2	4	8	12	8	4	2
___	___	___	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	___	___	___
	___	___	___	___	___	
	___	___	___	___	___	
		___	___	___		
		___	___	___		
		___	___	___		
		___	___	___		
			___			
			___			
			___			
			___			

Thank you for your help!

Table 1

Rotated Factor Matrix

	FACTOR I	FACTOR II	FACTOR III
PERSON 1	.22435	.09306	**.59123**
PERSON 2	-.13540	**.67878**	-.07284
PERSON 3	-.10687	**.54518**	.11009
PERSON 4	.07550	**.78000**	.25314
PERSON 5	.36254	**.54675**	.27859
PERSON 6	**.65983**	-.04241	-.00695
PERSON 7	**.47090**	**.64151**	.15422
PERSON 8	**.43771**	.18762	.21318
PERSON 9	.06889	.05966	**.81264**
PERSON 10	**.77910**	.14270	.17140
PERSON 11	**.69449**	.01872	.12200
PERSON 12	-.17819	.37859	**.74096**
PERSON 13	.42252	.03750	**.62989**
PERSON 14	.38549	.16556	**.67203**
PERSON 15	.22919	**.77683**	.08463
PERSON 16	**.78568**	.02175	.06266
PERSON 17	**.56090**	-.01099	.28861

Note: Factor structure coefficients ≥ .43 are highlighted.

Table 2

Factor Scores for Items 1-40

	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
1	-.50730	.00784	.75277
2	**1.54560**	.21832	-.94824
3	-.16401	.24289	-.66433
4	**-1.50856**	-.98031	-.14051
5	-.26223	.34421	**1.52897**
6	-.13487	**-1.11802**	-.24153
7	**-1.01833**	.71033	**-1.58333**
8	-.71210	**1.16774**	.89497
9	.23628	-.05072	.86547
10	.17414	.22668	.58915
11	**-1.81718**	-.67730	.56244
12	.68653	.20639	-.80285
13	-.17784	.01947	**1.06254**
14	-.76809	**-1.00959**	.14394
15	**-1.57748**	**1.12270**	-.66847
16	.20604	**2.68943**	-.82096
17	.10702	**-1.00073**	**-1.24023**
18	.58517	.52406	**2.02621**
19	.95113	.34170	.29625
20	**2.52036**	**-1.81663**	**-1.90405**
21	-.32814	-.23565	-.87114
22	-.69688	**1.50662**	**-1.10422**
23	-.17402	-.85312	.18230
24	.77836	-.12852	**1.56184**
25	.33287	-.51225	**1.03003**
26	-.13618	**-1.37682**	.23757
27	-.61195	-.19214	**2.57080**
28	**1.40114**	**1.60713**	.34722
29	.84056	-.36121	-.99028
30	**-1.28418**	**1.23065**	**-1.22724**
31	-.44302	. 24109	.09515
32	-.53500	**-1.63109**	-.60804
33	.47245	.62248	.29174
34	**1.72513**	.90295	-.56226
35	**2.09132**	-.75870	**1.06755**
36	-.27656	**-1.09525**	-.78991
37	**-1.83697**	**-1.19626**	-.52165
38	-.16468	**1.70015**	-.26833
39	.02195	-.65065	-.04965
40	.45951	.01215	-.09972

Note: Factor scores ≥ |1.00| are highlighted.